The Inside Story of Harold Stassen's Talks With the Russians, Pages 2 and 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 9 MARCH 3, 1958 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

How Gullible Senate Liberals Are Doing the State Dept.'s Handiwork

A Bill to Undermine the Right to Travel

For three years the State Department has been working with Chairman Walter of House Un-American to get a bill through Congress which would validate its restrictions on the right to travel. The last time public hearings were held on that bill of Walter's in May, 1956, the only two witnesses who turned up in favor of it were Scott McLeod and Frances Knight of the passport division. The bill was buried in House Judiciary. Now the Department is trying to achieve the same purpose through liberals in the Senate. It has succeeded in getting Hennings of Missouri to front for it and he has persuaded almost the entire liberal membership to join him in sponsoring the equivalent of the old Walter bill. The Senators gullible enough to fall for this crafty strategem are Anderson, Carroll, Clark, Flanders, Humphrey, Ives, Javits, Langer, Magnuson, Morse, Murray, Neuberger, Proxmire, Symington and Chavez. We have too much respect for these Senators to believe they really know what they're doing.

Walter and Hennings Bills Agree

Walter called his a bill to guarantee passport applicants their day in court. Hennings introduced his last Monday (S3344) as a bill to guarantee the right to travel. Both commercials were phoney. Both bills pick up verbatim the language of the State Department's passport restrictions now awaiting adjudication on appeal to the Supreme Court. If the liberal Senators who so hastily put their names behind this new measure will compare its language with that of the old Walter bill and the department regulations, they will see how completely they have been taken in. All three contain the identical phrasing which allows the Department to refuse passports not only to members of organizations determined to be communistic under the Internal Security Act of 1950 but also to persons "who have terminated such membership under such circumstances as to warrant the conclusion that they continue to act in furtherance of the Communist movement" or "who, regardless of the formal state of their affiliation with the Communist party, engage in activities which support the Communist movement" under circumstances the Department may deem indicative of Communist direction. This is sweeping enough to cover people who agree with Morse on China policy or with Humphrey on nuclear testing.

At the Mercy of Faceless Informers

The Hennings bill is as bad on procedure as on substantive rights. The departmental regulations say the Board of Passport Appeals shall conduct hearings "in such manner as to protect from disclosure information affecting the national security. . . ." The Walter bill carried a similar provision. So does the Hennings measure. It says, "The Board shall insure, *consistent with national security,* that all evidence and witnesses relied upon are produced and made a part of the open record." The italics are added to indicate the ample loophole. How can lawyers like Morse and Javits support a measure so contrary to traditional standards of due process and fair trial? This means that a man may lose his right to travel—and bear the stigma of a citizen his government does not trust with a passport—on the basis of undisclosed allegations from faceless informers.

Worse Than The Oath Requirement

The Hennings bill enters a third area now under litigation. The Department's requirement of a non-Communist affidavit for the right to travel also awaits examination in the Supreme Court. The Hennings bill would authorize not only a non-Communist affidavit but "a written application, duly verified by oath or affirmation . . . containing a true recital of each and every matter of fact which may be required" by the Department. This opens every applicant to inquisition on that wide range of activities and opinions needed to judge whether a man, though no longer or ever a Communist, may seem to the Department to be supporting Communist causes under Communist direction. To permit such inquisition under oath is to force applicants to run the gauntlet of perjury in an area broad enough to cover topics on which the State Department regards many of these liberal Senators as themselves suspiciously misguided. How can they present this as a bill to safeguard the right to travel?

The One Fig-Leaf

The one liberal fig-leaf on this naked fraud is a provision which would allow persons to enter areas like Communist China *if they signed an affidavit waiving the protection of* the United States while in such countries. But the price of this solitary reform is to freeze into law the restrictions the Department imposes both on the right to travel and on the right to a fair hearing just when there is hope of a final ruling on them by the Supreme Court. Since not a single newspaper seems to have reported the introduction of this bill, there is danger it might slip through. We urge readers to write these Senators, to demand a public hearing and to do all they can to block the Department's effort to do through unthinking Senate liberals what it was unable to do through Walter in the House. This bill might undo the effect of a passport victory in the Supreme Court.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stassen's Chief Assistant Lifts the Curtain on Their Talks with the Russians . . .

By Robert E. Matteson

Mr. Matteson was Stassen's chief assistant and is still director of the White House Disarmament Staff pending an expected reorganization. This is taken from a speech he made at the University of Minnesota Conference on "National Security in the Nuclear Age" on Feb. 18 to which little attention has been paid, except by the alert Chalmers Roberts of the Washington Post. A United Press dispatch in the New York Herald-Tribune (Feb. 24) said the speech with its hopeful emphasis on negotiation and co-existence "is known to have angered Mr. Dulles."

During the past 11 years I have had the opportunity of talking to many Russians not only in the Soviet Union but in England, and in the United States. I was fortunate to be able to sit in on the long conference that Mr. Stassen had with Generalissimo Stalin on a winter night in 1947 in the Kremlin and that same year sat in on the conference with Krushchev, Mikoyan, Vosnessensky, Zhdanov and Molotov. We visited Russians peasants in their cottages and on their collective farms in the Ukraine, and Russian workers in their living quarters in western Siberia and in their factories in Sverdlovsk, Stalingrad, Moscow, Kiev, and Leningrad. Particularly during the last two years, we have had —through the disarmament negotiations in London and in New York — an exceptional opportunity to observe their methods and their personalities at close range. For example, there was the 2½ hour conference we had with Krushchev at Claridge's in London in April 1956. There have been a great many bilateral conversations with members of the Soviet Delegations in London and at the United Nations carried on with the knowledge and consent of our Western partners. Likewise, I have read the reports of others on Russia and have talked with or listened to many of our experts *on* the Soviet Union, including our Ambassadors.

From all of these experiences and information, I have the following personal impressions:

The Russian People

First, the most surprising thing about the Soviet Union is how little their people resemble their government and how much more like us they are. Yet, because they are fed constantly only the Communist creed, most of them are favorable to their government and believe only what they are told.

Second, I believe there is today in Russia great pressure from the Russian people on the leaders of the Soviet Communist Party and government for peace and for agreement with the United States.

Third, the Soviet Communists (in number they equal about 3% of the population) are supremely confident that Communism will in the end triumph in the world, and it is unmistakably evident that they will do everything in their power short of general war to see to it that it does triumph.

Fourth, the Soviet leadership would like to negotiate an agreement with the United States primarily for the purpose of relaxing tension.

Fifth, the area of greatest interest to the Soviet Union for such an agreement appears to be in the disarmament field.

Sixth, Russia suffers from a real feeling of inferiority and this is a key to many of their attitudes, for example, their great desire to be accepted as an equal power and, to some extent, their insistence on a recognition by the West of the status quo.

Collapse Unlikely

Seventh, the Soviet Union is a powerful nation and is not likely to collapse either from external pressure or from internal difficulties. The evidence thus far is that even the shifts in leadership at the top seem to have resulted in greater strength rather than in greater weakness.

Eighth, and possibly the most important of all, there is increasing evidence that the Soviet Union under the right circumstances will gradually evolve toward greater and greater freedom, both with respect to its internal domestic relations and also in respect to its relations with the outside world.

This favorable prospect for gradual evolution appears to be the result of: the death of Stalin and the emergence of a somewhat different type of leadership; a greater sense of security resulting from the Soviet nuclear-missile-satellite developments; the spread of education; the improved standard of living; increasing contacts, by one method or another, of an increasing number of Russians with the free world; the rise in the lower echelons of Government of more open-minded, less dogmatic leaders, the fact that the urge for freedom cannot be rooted out either be force or by fraud; and, not the least, the fact that the Russian people, on the whole, are human beings with human reactions. For the most part, the Russian people, as I have found them, are friendly, warm hearted, and generous people. In saying this, I realize it goes against a stereotype that has been built up by some of our newspapers, leaders, and even educators. But it is a fact that until some of our misconceptions about them are

More Afraid They Might Be Sincere

"High officials of the State Dept. are saying privately that because of the pressure from world opinion, Mr. John Foster Dulles feels that he must give the appearance of being receptive to the idea of a properly prepared summit meeting, but that in fact he is anxious to avoid such a meeting. He objects to a summit meeting not so much because of his conviction that the Russians are insincere; he would be much more worried if he thought a summit meeting could lead to disengagement. . . ."

—Philip Deane, from Washington in London Observer News Service, Jerusalem Post, Feb. 14.

Are We Really Ahead of the Russians Only in Tomahawks and Scalping Knives?

"We are caught today in the most ominous armament race of all time with little more than a niblick and a fleet of white elephant carriers. . . . America today is in the greatest danger since Valley Forge. . . . We are behind the Russians today in the intercontinental ballistic missile race. . . . But we are ahead of the Russians in supercarriers, tomahawks and scalping knives."

—Cong. Clarence Cannon (D. Mo.), speech, "Not A Minute to Lose", in the House, Feb. 18.

"The United States will have in the next fiscal year something like 4,000 to 5,000 aircraft . . . each capable of carrying a thermonuclear weapon of megaton range . . . And our atomic armory has at least two such weapons for every available plane in addition to thousands of smaller so-called tactical weapons.

"This represents collectively a tremendous factor of safety and a gigantic 'over-kill' capability. There are less than 200 cities with populations of more than 50,000 in the Soviet Union; of these many are industrially and militarily inconsequential. There actually are no more than about 60 to 100 prime targets in the Soviet Union.

"Thus, the United Sttaes has today the theoretical capability of wiping out each prime target in Soviet Russia 40 to 50 times."

—Hanson W. Baldwin, survey of U.S. military strength, New York Times, Feb. 3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . and Sets Forth the Case for Peaceful Co-Existence With Them

corrected—as well as their misconceptions about us—there will not be a sound basis for improved relations between us. In this regard, it is possible that the road from the grey world to the white world may, at this particular time, more easily be traversed by way of expanding East-West contacts, particularly the exchange of personal visits at all levels, than by any other procedure. For this reason the Exchange Agreement with Russia signed three weeks ago could prove to be a significant beginning.

Why They Fear War

Above everything else, the Russian leaders are confident that time is on their side; that the dialectic of history will move the people of the world inexorably, scientifically toward acceptance of a Communist world. The one thing they seem to fear is that a minor incident, a miscalculation, or the contradictions of "the imperialist, capitalist system" will set off a general war that will devastate the world—including, of course, themselves. Therefore, the Soviet leadership sees it in their interest to avoid a general nuclear war, to stress peaceful coexistence and competition, and to seek and use every opportunity at hand—whether it be disarmament negotiations, the Brussels Fair, a chess match, a Summit conference, student exchanges, or even a private dinner conversation—to advance the ball toward the goal of world Communism. To the Communist the end justifies the means and he will, with skill and determination, use any means to achieve this goal. At the same time, he is recognizing that technology is imposing its own changes on Communist doctrine by fixing limits to the means which can be safely used to achieve its ends.

However, there is hope in all of this for it is bringing Krushchev and the Soviet people out from behind their Iron Curtain at the same time that it is permitting some relaxation on the movement of people and information from the free world into the Soviet Bloc territory. To an increasing extent, the Soviet intelligentsia—the writers, the scientists, the younger leaders— are beginning to see and reflect the first direct rays of sunlight—rather than viewing through Stalin spectacles the distorted shadows on their cold prison walls. To an increasing extent, the Soviet mind—twisted and frozen into an iron mould—is beginning to thaw. And it is the scientists, I believe, who are leading the way. For if they are to be effective in their contribution to the Soviet military might, they must be permitted to seek out the truth, wherever it is. When science and Communist doctrine are in conflict, the present Soviet leaders have allowed science to win. To an increasing extent, therefore, through the cracks and crevices of the Iron Curtain, the winds of freedom are beginning to penetrate.

If We Have Confidence

If we have confidence in our system, if we are wise and vigilant in our policies and actions, we should welcome and encourage this change from the Stalin period as an opportunity to evolve the Soviet system toward freedom—rather than, as we too often do, view it more as something to be feared and as a threat to the very existence of the free world. If we have no confidence in ourselves and in our system, we had better start digging holes in the ground, excavating our cities, putting our children in subterranean vaults, and wearing asbestos and decontamination suits.

The central question of our time, stripped of all its masks, is whether the free world is capable of successfully competing with the Communist world for the very existence of a free world. . . .

If one's answer to this question of competition is that the free world has the capability of competing successfully with the Communist world despite those advantages which the Communist world has in such competition, the general policy adopted toward Russia would be one of permitting and encouraging Communism to come out from behind the Iron Curtain and of gradually opening and exposing the Communist world to freedom. . . .

Time for Boldness

On the other hand, if one's answer to this question is that the free world stands a poor chance of competing successfully with the Communist world because of the various advantages the Communist world has in any such competition —then the general policy adopted toward Russia would be one of bottling up communists and communism within its present Iron Curtain area and seeking by outside pressures and inside subversion to so disrupt and weaken the communist regime that it would fall from within—and thus prevent communism from flowing out to contaminate and subvert the free world.

Such a statement of alternative policies represents a necessary oversimplification of two opposing conceptions. The fact is, of course, that these policies cannot be painted in black and white terms—that there are in practice in the policies of free governments elements of each. But it is true that today in Washington and in the other free world capitals, there exists in the policy formulation process within governments a day-to-day competition between the major emphases of these two different concepts. One cannot be dogmatic and wise enough to know that one or the other is right, but it is my belief that we may very well be at one of those great historical divides where a boldness in exploration of the "relaxation of tension" concept might pay greater dividends than we now suspect for the future of world peace.

Paradise for Junkmen

Military spending is now too astronomical really to be grasped. Some idea of its magnitude may be obtained from the figures on the value of the military equipment we scrap each year. This may be found in the budget for each military service under the heading, "Preparation for Sale or Salvage of Military Property." This gives the tonnage and dollar cost of each year's scrapped equipment, plus the cost of getting rid of it and the net amount to be recovered.

For fiscal 1957, 1958 and 1959 the total dollar value of the equipment scrapped is $13,295,556,000, an average of more than $4 billion a year or just about the amount it cost to run the entire Federal government, defense and all, in the 1920's. The total net recovery for the three years is figured at $390,739,280, or about 3 cents on the dollar.

What We Spend on Armament and Disarmament Compared

Fiscal Year	Defense Spending	Disarmament Staffs*
1956	$41,825,000,000	$489,190
1957	$44,414,000,000	$571,448
1958	$44,871,000,000	$425,000
1959	$45,836,000,000	— — —
	$176,946,000,000	$1,485,638

—Compiled by Committee for World Development and World Disarmament.

* White House (Stassen Disarmament Staff) plus Senate (Humphrey) Subcommittee on Disarmament.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chicago Tribune Reports Pressure on Witch Hunters to Pipe Down

Watch Indonesia: It Fits the Rockefeller Report Pattern for Intervention

ALARUM: The counter revolutionary uprising in Indonesia fits the patern for interventionism outlined in the Rockefeller Brothers report. From an oil company point of view the situation may well be regarded as an example of what the report mystically terms "non-overt aggression". On the surface it is not aggression at all but an effort by force and violence to overturn the constituted government. But the oil companies may fear that the Indonesian regime's "guided democracy" might easily guide it toward nationalization of oil resources. The heart of the revolt, Central Sumatra, is also the site of the oil fields. Mr. Dulles has already given the revolt his blessing and it would be interesting to know what Brother Allen W. has been doing to help it along through the secret funds and operatives of CIA. These distant isles would seem an ideal testing place for limited preventive war in support of the rebellion. Those members of Congress who believe in peace would do well to turn the spotlight on Indonesia now before some incident occurs or is manufactured.

ADD OUR LAST WEEK'S STORY ON LACK OF INSTRUCTIONS TO OUR MOSCOW EMBASSY: "The drive toward a summit conference," said an Associated Press dispatch from Moscow in the *Baltimore Sun* Feb. 24, "appeared stalled. . . . A survey of Western diplomats in the Soviet capital showed none had instructions from home to initiate any move to get the diplomatic work started."

WITCH HUNTERS IN TROUBLE? The *Chicago Tribune's* well-informed Washington correspondent, Willard Edwards, reported (Feb. 24) that the Senate Internal Security subcommittee's annual report has been held up by the failure of two Senators to sign it. Watkins (R. Utah) "has refused to sign" but won't explain why and Chairman Eastland says he hasn't signed because he's been "too busy to read it." The subcommittee has an unwritten rule 7 years old requiring unanimous reports. Edwards said the circumstances suggest "political pressures by both Democratic and Republican leaders" on the subcommittee and added that in the House, Chairman Walter of Un-American Activities, has also been asked to "play down" investigations this year but has refused.

ARGENTINA: The Frondizi election was a defeat for the Catholic Church (which once supported Peron against him) and for U.S. oil companies which fear his nationalization program.

PORTENT: The new Soviet Ambassador Menshikov gave Marguerite Higgins an interview (*New York Herald-Tribune*, Feb. 21) in which he denied Krushchev was a one-man dictator. "These things," he said of the shakeup in which Molotov, Malenkov and Kaganovich were demoted "are not decided by Mr. Krushchev alone, by any means. . . . It is a mistake to think that Krushchev can act without consultation and consent of others. . . . He is very much a collective leader. . . . These things are not decided by any one man. . . "

POLAND STILL "DIFFERENT": A little noticed agreement was signed Feb 12 between the U.S. and Poland for the purchase by the latter with its own currency of $1,000,000 worth of U.S. books, films, periodicals, recordings and authors' rights. . . . Poland is still the only place in the Soviet bloc (and Yugoslavia) where Western periodicals and newspapers are freely available. . . . Since *Pravda* and *Izvestia* can be bought on public newsstands in New York, why doesn't the U.S. ask for public sale of the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* in Moscow? . . .

QUICKLY SUPPRESSED BY MOST PAPERS: Russ Nixon's letter to Senator McClellan released here Feb. 24 charging that one of the Senator's committee counsel, John J. McGovern, asked Nixon, the U.E.'s Washington representative, to supply the McClellan committee secretly with material which could be used against the United Auto Workers leadership in the forthcoming Kohler strike hearings.

Chicago Tribune Rebukes Jenner

It is unusual for the Washington Post and the Chicago Tribune to agree. It is pleasant to record that on Feb. 24 by a remarkable coincidence both publications led off their editorial pages with attacks on the Jenner bill (S2646) to curtail the power of the Supreme Court to hear appeals in contempt of Congress convictions and similar cases involving radicals.

The Washington Post denounced the bill as an effort by the Senator to punish the Court for handing down decisions with which he disagreed. The Chicago Tribune recalled that the rightist Rumely also benefitted a few years ago from a Supreme Court decision reversing a contempt of Congress conviction on First Amendment grounds.

The Chicago Tribune said the fact that Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., of the ADA, had been the chief witness so far against the bill made the opposition to it appear "essentially left-wing" but added, "Nothing could be further from the truth. A conservative must be very short-sighted indeed to uphold the Jenner bill."

Send A Stamped Self-Addressed Envelope If You Want Our 1957 Index. Now Ready Free of Charge

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

3/3/58

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription $5 in th U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED